

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 099

CG 019 988

AUTHOR Pollock, Charles R.
TITLE Enrollment Management: No Little Plan for the Future of Student Affairs.
PUB DATE Mar 87
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American College Personnel Association/National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (Chicago, IL, March 15-18, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *College Planning; College Students; Declining Enrollment; Educational Trends; *Enrollment; Enrollment Projections; *Enrollment Trends; *Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Enrollment Management

ABSTRACT

Enrollment management deals with the quantity of students an institution enrolls; student body composition; and the quality of students, services, and programs. The enrollment growth in American higher education institutions has ceased and a decline is expected due to: (1) lack of financial aid; (2) a prosperous economy; (3) a less promising job outlook for college graduates; (4) competition from the military for high school graduates; and (5) a decline in the numbers of 18-24 year olds. Enrollment management is a holistic concept stressing a campus-wide approach to address issues of recruiting and retention as well as viewing the student as a "whole" person. To examine existing enrollment management programs, admissions directors (N=228) from institutions with enrollment management programs were interviewed in December 1985. Data were collected on institutional activities, the respondents' opinions on enrollment management issues, and institutional characteristics. The results indicated that institutions with enrollment management programs were doing more of the "right" things than were institutions not having programs. Establishing an enrollment management program appeared to be worth the commitment of resources necessary. When establishing an enrollment management program, colleges and universities should consider goals and objectives, institutional environment, structure, skills needed by staff, and research and evaluation of the program. (ABL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED283099

CE 019988

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT: NO LITTLE PLAN
FOR THE FUTURE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

A paper presented at the
ACPA/NASPA Annual Convention

March 15-18, 1987
Chicago Illinois

by

Charles R. Pollock, EdD
Western New England College
Springfield, MA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles R. Pollock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT: NO LITTLE PLAN FOR THE FUTURE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

This session will focus on enrollment management, a relatively new concept for higher education and student affairs. I intend to share relevant material from the growing body of enrollment management literature and information acquired through my doctoral research. A few comments on my research at this time will alleviate the need to stop and clarify information later. I prepared a questionnaire which addressed enrollment management structures and activities at four year institutions of higher education. The questionnaire was mailed to the Director of Admissions at randomly selected institutions in December, 1985; and 228 institutions responded. This represented a 77% response rate. I then interviewed individuals from institutions which have an enrollment management program.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT BACKGROUND

The term enrollment management was first used in reference to institutional attempts to handle the large increases of students in the 1960s. The term is currently associated with the decline in potential students; but it deals with more than the quantity of students which an institution wants to enroll. It also addresses issues concerning the composition of the student body, and issues concerning quality - quality of students, quality of services, and quality of programs. The number of classroom chairs which are filled is, however, a very important consideration for most institutions.

American higher education has been described as a growth industry because enrollments have increased almost steadily since Harvard was founded. The increases have now ceased and higher education will witness a reversal. It is projected that enrollments will decrease drastically by 1994.

There are several reasons why enrollments are forecast to decline. Some of these include:

- (1) Many students rely on financial aid to attend college; and we are all aware of the need for additional financial aid resources. The recent tightening of Guaranteed Student Loan eligibility will eliminate many students from this federal program. For students who can still qualify for loans, the willingness of students to assume educational debts must also be considered.
- (2) History has demonstrated that the economy has a reverse affect on student enrollment. When the economy is dynamic and employment opportunities are plentiful, many individuals are less inclined to enroll in college. Some are not willing to sacrifice immediate earning potential and perhaps assume educational debts to enroll in college. Since the economy is currently prosperous and unemployment rates are low in many sections of the country, this historical trend cannot be ignored.
- (3) Coupled with the economy factor is the fact that the job outlook for college graduates is not as promising as a decade ago. Arbeiter (1985) reported that many of the jobs

which will be available in the next ten years will not require a college degree. He also indicated that many college graduates are underemployed and hypothesized that this fact may influence some not to attend college. This may also encourage employers to hire high school graduates rather than college graduates who may become dissatisfied and alienated.

(4) The competition from the military cannot be overlooked. The military has become more technical and needs more qualified servicemen. The various military branches have been reaching their recruiting goals and over 90% are high school graduates. The military annually enlists approximately one of every five male, high school graduates (Arbeiter, 1985). As the number of graduates decline, they will be seeking a higher percentage.

(5) The last, and most important, reason of the anticipated decline is the changing demographics. Numerous analyses have been provided but the best known source is probably the Carnegie Council.

The Carnegie Council (1981) reported that the number of 18-24 year olds will decline by 23% from 1978 to 1994. They considered the fact that part of the decline should be offset by such factors as an increase in older, minority, and female students and an increase in retention rates; and predicted that the total full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment will decline between 5% and 15%.

The Carnegie Council's predictions included a decline between 1983 and the 1988-89 year, a plateau, and a second major decline from the fall of 1991 through the 1997-98 academic year. The first decline would represent approximately 40% of the drop, while the second decline would be equivalent to 60%.

The impact of the demographics was never hypothesized to affect all institutions evenly. Institutions located in the East and Midwest would be most severely impacted by the decline in traditional-aged students. The Council also forecast that less selective liberal arts colleges and private two-year colleges would be the most vulnerable to the changing demographics. (see Table 1)

TABLE 1
DEGREE OF VULNERABILITY

Institutional Type	Number of Institutions
Less Vulnerable	1144
Research Universities	98
Selective Liberal Arts Colleges	123
Public Two-year Colleges	923
Vulnerable	679
Doctorate-granting Universities	86
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities	593
More Vulnerable	723
Less Selective Liberal Arts Colleges	468
Private Two-year Colleges	255

Source: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1981). Three thousand futures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass quoting U.S. NCES 1979 data.

Keller (1983) predicted that between 10% and 30% of American colleges and universities would close or merge by 1995. This initially appears to be a drastic prediction until viewed in the context of the last four decades. Between 1940 and 1970, 0.5% of all institutions ceased operations or merged each year. The figure increased to 0.8% per year during the 1970s. Based on these trends, about 300 colleges (approximately 10%) could close by 2000 (Carnegie Council, 1981). Given the plight of many colleges during periods of expansion, the question is how many additional colleges will terminate existence during troubled times. The U.S. Department of Education data indicates that 726 colleges had full-time undergraduate enrollments under 500 in the fall of 1984 (The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 11, 1986); and I believe that many of these institutions may be very vulnerable. (see Table 2) A decline of only 50 students could have a major impact on some of these institutions.

Although the major drop in the traditional-aged college student is still forthcoming, the decline in college enrollments which was projected for the early 1980s did not materialize. Individual colleges have experienced a reduction in their enrollment, but the nation has witnessed enrollment increases for the first half of the decade. Ample time has not elapsed to fully explore the reasons for this, but several have been offered. According to Breland (1986) colleges have increased utilization of traditional recruiting activities such as high school visits, and newer approaches such as telemarketing and

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY
FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT IN THE FALL 1984

Number of Institutions				
Enrollment	Univer- sities	Other 4-year	2-year	Total
Under 200	0	256	73	329
200 - 499	0	241	156	397
500 - 999	0	345	192	537
1,000 - 2,499	0	496	358	854
2,500 - 4,999	6	238	223	467
5,000 - 9,999	33	169	167	369
10,000 - 19,999	57	99	86	242
20,000 - 29,999	34	14	22	70
30,000 or more	26	2	4	32
TOTAL	156	1860	1281	3297

Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education. (June 11, 1986). p. 22. quoting United States Department of Education.

direct mail campaigns. The result has been that a higher percentage of high school graduates have been enrolling in higher education. Frances (1984) indicated that the enrollment increases of the early 1980s can be traced to the economic recessions of the period (which encouraged some individuals who could not secure work to enroll in college), and the increasing number of older students, especially women.

I asked institutions in my research sample to forecast their 1994 full-time, undergraduate enrollment using 1984 as a base. The institutions were generally optimistic for this period. Only 18% predicted that their full-time, undergraduate enrollment will decline by more than 5%; and one-third anticipate increases greater than 5%. I then utilized data in two of the College

Board's The College Handbook to review the change in the sample's full-time, undergraduate enrollment for the period of fall 1980 to 1984. Thirty six percent of the institutions experienced declines greater than 5% during the early 1980s when enrollments rose nationwide. (see Table 3)

TABLE 3
ENROLLMENT CHANGES AT SURVEYED INSTITUTIONS

Change	Percent Experiencing Change 1980-84	Percent Predicting Change 1984-94
Increase Greater Than 5%	29%	33%
Stable (+ or - 5%)	35%	49%
Decrease Greater Than 5%	36%	18%

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) has provided data by state on the percentage change in high school graduates for the period of 1981 to the mid 1990s. Only three of my respondents who were from states which will experience declines projected drops in their enrollment which were equal to or greater than the decline in high school graduates for their states. In essence, the institutions in the research sample were predicting that they will make up for the decline in high school graduates by enrolling a higher percent of the graduates, enrolling more non-traditional students, or other alternatives. They were also not predicting a decline in the

quality of their student body. Only 8% of the respondents agreed with the statement that they will not - will not - be able to maintain the academic quality of their entering student body during the next ten years.

Are these predictions reasonable? Given the fact that over one-third of the institutions in the sample experienced enrollment declines greater than 5% during the early 1980s, is it reasonable for only 18% to forecast similar declines for the 1984-94 period? Is it reasonable for institutions which believe that they will maintain or increase their full-time, undergraduate enrollment to anticipate maintaining the quality of their freshmen class? If these are reasonable predictions, the respondents should be able to identify the reasons why they will be able to differ from the current projections. Why will they be able to maintain the same student body when the pool of traditional-aged students is shrinking? Why will they be able to maintain the quality of their student body when logic would indicate that they may have to enroll less qualified students to maintain their enrollment levels. If satisfactory justifications can not be given, then we must ask if the "ostrich syndrome" is present and individuals believe that "the other institution will be affected but mine won't." Every institution should carefully consider their own predictions. Are they reasonable? Can they be justified?

Last summer I attended an enrollment management conference sponsored by the College Board. During one of our discussions

groups, the facilitator asked if our institutions were experiencing any enrollment crisis. One individual from a church related institution which had a full-time, undergraduate enrollment of less than 300, indicated "NO", they did not have a crisis at his institution. Further discussion indicated that they had not met their enrollment goals for the fall and that \$300,000 had to be trimmed from their operating budget. I don't know what percent of their budget this would be, but I assume that it would be significant for an institution their size. After further discussion, he admitted to himself what he was trying to ignore - they had a crisis for the fall and the future would not appear brighter unless actions were initiated. How many additional colleges are having difficulty confronting their situation?

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT DEFINITION

The term enrollment management is really a misnomer. Institutions can influence their enrollments but they probably cannot manage them. With this in mind, I would like to share two common definitions of enrollment management. Hossler (1984) has provided one of the most comprehensive definitions:

Enrollment management can be defined as a process, or activity, that influences the size, the shape, and the characteristics of a student body by directing institutional efforts in marketing, recruitment, and admissions as well as pricing and financial aid. In

addition, the process exerts a significant influence on academic advising, institutional research agenda, orientation, retention studies, and student services. It is not simply an administrative process. Enrollment management involves the entire campus (pp. 5-6).

Kemerer, Baldrige, and Green (1982) provided a earlier definition which is not as comprehensive, but it articulates a very important element. They stated:

As a concept, enrollment management implies an assertive approach to ensuring the steady supply of qualified students required to maintain institutional vitality. As a procedure, enrollment management is a set of activities to help institutions interact more successfully with their potential students (p. 21).

The important distinction for us in Kemerer's definition is the idea of a concept - a philosophical orientation. It would be ideal for an institution to have a formal, organized enrollment management program; but the philosophical constructs for us as student affairs professionals are critical.

What am I referring to? Enrollment management is a holistic concept - holistic in two senses. Ideally, it should be a campus-wide approach to address issues of recruiting and retention. The faculty, student affairs professionals, and other administrators should jointly address the issues. Enrollment

management is also holistic in that it stresses viewing the student as a "whole person." It focuses on addressing the needs of students, and providing personalized services. It encompasses academic instruction; but it stresses the out-of-the-classroom experiences. It begins with the admissions office admitting students who have the potential to be graduates rather than just freshmen to fill quotes, and it provides assistance to help students become graduates. Orientation programs, student services, academic advising, career planning, academic support programs, financial aid, retention programs, etc. are designed and integrated - and integrated - to help the student succeed.

Does this sound like the Student Personnel Point of View? One could easily argue the parallelism between the two terms. The 1937 American Council on Education report indicated that the Student Personnel Point of View stressed a holistic, humanistic view of the student. It considered the whole student with emotional, physical, social, vocational, and moral needs to be addressed in addition to providing academic instruction. The report outlined 23 services many of which I mentioned in the definition of enrollment management.

One could also argue that student affairs offices have become very specialized and independent, that we have drifted away from the Student Personnel Point of View, and that we are now coming back to it from a different approach - an approach which is based on the potential change in the quantity and/or quality of our student bodies. There is, however, a danger in

the enrollment management approach. If institutions are guided by their enrollment fears instead of a concern for the student, they may lose sight of the student. For example, the retention literature indicates that the goal of a retention program should not be to retain more students. Rather, it should be to provide quality programs and services. These in turn will enable and encourage more students to stay enrolled. The focus for enrollment management should be the same - on the students and the services which they need.

Enrollment management has as its foundation a marketing orientation which Leach indicated "stresses identification of consumers' needs, the development of a systematic plan for responding to those needs, and the assessment of the impact of the plan" (Leach, 1984, p. 10). This marketing or consumer orientation is very important, and it differs from the sales orientation which is common on many campuses. It recognizes that there are three major factors which influence a student to attend one college rather than another, or to stay enrolled. The first two are the competition and environmental factors. A college has no control over these. The third factor is the institution itself, and the institution can increase efforts to provide quality programs and services which address the needs of the whole student. If the institution is providing a quality product, students will be more inclined to enroll and persist.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT MODELS

Four models or organizational structures for enrollment management programs are described in the literature (Kemerer, et. al., 1982).

The Marketing Committee is primarily an advisory body which is involved with the institution's recruitment activities and policies. The committee's primary functions should be to (a) analyze the college's admissions data, especially the institution's primary and secondary markets; (b) conduct research on student life, and campus issues; (c) evaluate the academic programs, instruction, and student services with the intention of identifying and strengthening weak areas; and (d) review promotional literature and activities. Its role, therefore, exceeds the typical jurisdiction of the traditional admissions committee and it is important to note that a marketing committee is not equivalent to an admissions committee. The committee approach raises the college community's awareness and involves various segments of the campus; but it does not have any direct control. It serves only in an advisory capacity.

The Director of Enrollment Management (or similar titles for a staff coordinator) is a new administrative position. The director of enrollment management is described as being responsible for coordinating the various offices or functions involved in recruiting and retention (i.e. admissions, marketing, retention, financial aid, etc.), developing a marketing plan,

disseminating data to the college community, and conducting market research and enrollment forecasts. The director, however, would not have line authority or fiscal control over the other areas; he/she would be primarily concerned with coordination. An avenue being pursued at some institutions is changing the title of the admissions director and, perhaps, increasing his/her responsibilities such as supervising financial aid. Although this may be a valuable change for some institutions, this is NOT an enrollment management program and not consistent with the director of enrollment management concept. An admissions management program is not the same as an enrollment management program. Enrollment management includes all phases from the inquiry stage to the alumni stage.

The Matrix System links enrollment management functions under the jurisdiction of a senior administrator, usually a vice president. The areas are grouped by the impact which they have on the enrollment cycle, not on a typical bureaucratic structure. Table 4 depicts the various offices or functions under each of the four modules. The matrix system links the various units of the campus and coordinates activities without major organizational changes. It encourages the campus community to become involved in the enrollment management process through one of the modules and it can be an effective approach.

TABLE 4

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT MATRIX SYSTEM

Marketing Services (Recruitment)

Image Identification
Market Segmentation
Media Strategies

Enrollment Services (Yield of Applicants to Enrollees)

Admissions
Financial Aid
Orientation
Departmental and Alumni Contacts

Retention Services (Controlled Attrition)

Registration
Financial Aid
Advising
Departmental Contacts

Research Services (Information for Systematic Adjustment of
Enrollment Management Models)

Questionnaires
Demographics
Local and National Trend Analysis

Source: Kemerer, F., Baldrige, J. V., & Green, K. C. (1982).
Strategies for effective enrollment management. Washington:
American Association of State Colleges and Universities. p. 35.
quoting Kreutner, L. & Godfrey, E. S. (Winter 1980-81).
"Enrollment management: A new vehicle for institutional renewal."
College Board Review, No. 118, pp. 6-9, 29.

The Enrollment Management Division is the ultimate model.
It is highly structured and it has been advocated because the
other models do not provide sufficient responsibility, fiscal
control, status, or legitimacy to the person(s) responsible for
enrollment management efforts. Caren and Kemerer (1979) offered
an example of an organizational chart for institutions which
enrolled between 5,000 and 10,000 students. They created a
position titled Vice President for Institutional Advancement and

had the areas indicated in Table 5 reporting to him/her.

Table 5

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Vice President for Academic Affairs
Vice President for Student Affairs
Vice President for Administrative Services
Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Admissions
Financial Aid
Long Range Planning
Institutional Research
Public Relations and Publications
Career Planning and Placement
Alumni Office
Development Office

Source: Kemerer, F., Baldrige, J. V., & Green, K. C. (1982). Strategies for effective enrollment management. Washington: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. p. 38. quoting Caren, W. A. and Kemerer, F. R. (Spring 1979). "The internal dimensions of institutional marketing." College and University, pp. 173-188.

I need to emphasize that an enrollment management division and a student affairs division are not synonymous. A student affairs division on most campuses would include some areas which are not critical to recruiting and retention, and do not include other areas that are essential. I asked my research respondents to indicate which areas they would include in an "ideal" enrollment management division on their campus. Table 6 provides the offices in order of the percentage of the respondents which considered the office as "essential" to be in an enrollment management division. You will note that some areas which are traditionally student affairs appear lower on the list.

TABLE 6
OFFICES TO BE INCLUDED IN AN
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Office	Percent Considering Inclusion of the Office to be Essential
Admissions	99%
Retention	90%
Financial Aid	90%
Marketing	80%
Academic Advising	74%
Orientation	71%
Institutional Research	64%
Dean of Students	50%
Counseling	44%
Housing	43%
Career Planning and Placement	40%
Registrar	39%
Minority Student Affairs	39%
Public Relations	36%
Student Activities	32%
Remedial/Study Skills Services	31%
Student Employment	19%
Alumni Affairs	17%
International Student Affairs	15%
Development Office	10%

These four models are, obviously, not the only ones. An institution may develop their own structure which is completely different than those which I have described, but which meets their enrollment management needs. Some may have more than one model. For example, they may utilize a marketing committee in conjunction with a director of enrollment management. A primary theme which emerged when I interviewed individuals who have an enrollment management program at their institution is that there is no ideal model. The best enrollment management structure for

a campus will depend on:

1. the institution,
2. the degree (if any) of enrollment crisis,
3. the personalities and skills of those involved,
4. the objectives to be accomplished, and
5. and the "readiness" of the campus to the concept of enrollment management.

Therefore, institutional leaders must carefully examine their situation before proposing (or changing) an enrollment management program.

I questioned whether enrollment management was primarily a theoretical concept, or whether many institutions were adopting enrollment management programs. In my questionnaire I provided a brief description of the four models and asked respondents to indicate if they utilized one of the models or had an "Other Structure", an enrollment management program which did not match one of the models. Fifty nine percent (59%) of the respondents indicated that they were using some formal enrollment management program. Several of the institutions which listed "Other" have an enrollment management division structure. They described their program and the only difference between their structure and the division was the offices which I included in my example. (see Table 8)

I was initially surprised that 59% had some type of enrollment management program. However, when I examined the academic year in which the enrollment management program was

TABLE 8
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS UTILIZED

Program	Percent Utilizing
Marketing Committee	17%
Staff Coordinator	10%
Matrix System	7%
Enrollment Management Division	8%
"Other Structure"	17%
Total -- Some Program	59%
No Program	41%

initiated, I found that half of the programs had been adopted during or since the 1983-84 academic year. I also asked those that did not have an enrollment management program if they believed that their institution would be establishing one by 1990. Almost 75% responded affirmatively; they anticipate an enrollment management program on their campus. I, therefore, believe that enrollment management is a growing element in higher education and we must all be prepared for it.

The creation of an enrollment management program may involve a considerable amount of time, energy, and (sometimes) financial resources. Whether or not the commitment is beneficial must be considered. Since enrollment management as a formal, integrated approach is relatively new; one cannot judge the effectiveness of a program on qualitative or quantitative measures of the student body. I, therefore, approached the problem in two subjective ways. First, I created 11 indices by scoring a series of

questions which required yes or no responses, or strongly disagree to strongly agree responses. The indices dealt with the institutional activities and the respondents' opinions on enrollment management issues. A total score was created for the two groupings and a grand total score was calculated. A few samples of questions are:

1. We have conducted within the last two years research on non-matriculating accepted applicants' attitudes toward the institution.
2. As part of the college's attrition-retention efforts, students who do not enroll the following semester are contacted.
3. Enrollment management issues have a high priority for institutional research.
4. This institution considers the recruitment of students to be a total college endeavor rather than the responsibility of the Admissions Office.
5. This institution has made a serious attempt to reduce our attrition rate.
6. The institution's intra-office coordination to address enrollment management issues is adequate.

A review of the literature was undertaken to arrive at appropriate questions.

I considered the 11 indices with five groupings.

1. The presence of an enrollment management program.
2. Control - public or independent.

3. Admissions selectivity - using the Barron's college ratings, institutions were classified as highly competitive, competitive, and less competitive.
4. Change in enrollment - whether the college gained or loss more than the median percentage for colleges in the sample during the 1980-84 period.
5. Size.

I tested the difference in the scores for each grouping which had dichotomous variables with a T Test. I also divided the scores at the median and used a Chi Square analysis to look for statistically significant differences for the groupings. The presence of an enrollment management program resulted in statistically significant (higher scores) the most often. Out of the eleven indices, significant differences were identified 11 times using the T test and eight times using the Chi Square analysis. I analyzed the data in several manners and found that the presence of an enrollment management program rather than the fact that it was an independent college or a highly competitive institution was the primary factor of those that I studied which correlated with the higher scores. I concluded that institutions which have an enrollment management program are doing more of what I considered "The Right Things" than institutions that do not have a program. Without going into more detail, it appeared that, based on my research, establishing an enrollment management program is worth the time, energy, financial resources, and commitment which is necessary. (see Table 9)

I also asked respondents to evaluate the effectiveness of their current and previous enrollment management programs. Individuals responded to a continuum of 1 (not effective) to 9 (very effective). Individuals responded most favorably to an Enrollment Management Division and least favorably to the Marketing Committee. (see Table 10)

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT INDICES
SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL
(Maximum possible = 11)

Variable	T Test	Chi Square
Presence of an Enrollment Management Program	11	8
Control (Public or Independent)	7	5
Enrollment Change	4	1
Admissions Selectivity	N/A	5
Size	N/A	1

TABLE 10
EFFECTIVENESS OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Structure	N	Mean	Median	Range
Enrollment Management Division	15	7.1	7.0	5-9
"Other Structure"	32	6.4	6.0	3-9
Matrix System	22	6.2	6.0	3-9
Staff Coordinator	28	5.6	6.5	1-9
Marketing Committee	56	4.8	5.0	1-8

Rating Scale: 1 = Not effective 9 = Very effective

When I interviewed individuals, I explored this and learned that some found the committee structure to be effective, but its value depended on its members. When the committee was composed of vice presidential members, it had the power to make critical decisions and create change. This type of committee, therefore, is different than the model previously described which has only an advisory role. Many who currently or previously utilized a committee structure, however, had negative comments. Many felt that the committee approach to enrollment management was not effective because enrollment management committees

1. move too slowly and quick, strategic decisions are needed in enrollment management;
2. tend to deal with superficial issues;
3. talk extensively but are not action oriented; and
4. are not detail oriented.

William Wilkerson addressed the same issue when he portrayed the anatomy of an organization as having four different types of bones. He indicated that organizations are composed of:

Wish-bones - who wish someone else would do the work.

Jaw-bones - who talk a lot but do little else.

Knuckle-bones - who knock what everyone else does.

Back-bones - who get down and actually do the work.

(quoted by LeBoeuf, M. (1984). The greatest management principle in the world. New York: G. P. Putnam's sons.)

The individuals whom I interviewed felt that a more structured approach to enrollment management was the most

beneficial since it concentrated authority and responsibility on one individual. The commitment of the entire campus, however, is necessary and a committee working in conjunction with another structure might be ideal.

GUIDELINES FOR ESTABLISHING AN ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

If an institution concludes that an enrollment management program may be appropriate for them, how do they proceed in establishing one? This is a critical question. One of the themes which surfaced during my interviews with institutions that have an enrollment management program is that it is very important to communicate to the college community the administration's intentions before a program is initiated. Key administrators and faculty members should have an opportunity for input before the plan is near the final stages. The entire campus needs to understand in order to be supportive and to cooperate. Also, the hierarchical and cooperative relationships should be detailed in advance. For example, if a director of enrollment management has general responsibilities for new student orientation but does not have line authority for the person who has direct control of the orientation program, what should their working relationship be?

I believe that several factors must be considered when contemplating an enrollment management program and they should be considered in this order.

1. Goals and Objectives. Do you really need an enrollment

management program? If you do, is its purpose to maintain enrollment, increase enrollment, increase the quality of the student body, or change the composition of the student body? If there is not a clear understanding and consensus, the institution will have problems in establishing a program; and varying goals will affect the program to be implemented.

2. Institutional environment and resources. The leadership style of the organization, the attitudes of the faculty, institutional politics, etc. must be considered. If financial resources are limited, is the institution prepared to reallocate existing funds? If appropriate computer support is not available, can arrangements be made to acquire it? Opportunities and constraints must be carefully analyzed.

3. Structure. The next step would be to decide what is the best structure or structures to accomplish the objectives. As stated earlier, there is no ideal enrollment management structure which is appropriate for every institution, so you need to decide what is best for your situation.

4. Skills. Once the objectives are defined and the structure is chosen, the appropriate skills for those involved can be defined. Are skills in planning, implementation, retention, recruiting, research and evaluation, leadership, institutional politics, or other skills required?

5. Staff. After the skills are defined, you can then look at the staff which is necessary. If you are looking at an enrollment management committee, you want to have as members

individuals who have the required skills rather than popular individuals or volunteers. You may want the Associate Director of Financial Aid instead of the Director to be involved because the particular research expertise of this person. If you are looking at a model similar to the director of enrollment management, are there individuals on campus who possess the required skills? Can positions be redefined or individuals moved to another position? If the required skills are not on campus, can you hire additional staff who have the necessary skills? The temptation is to look at titles and not individuals. One must be careful not to overlook someone with the appropriate skills because of their current position title. Likewise, one should not be promoted into such as position if he/she does not have the proper skills.

6. Research and Evaluation If you have established an enrollment management program, how will you determine if your goals and objectives are being met? What kind of research or evaluation will be necessary to refine or alter your approach? We are often guilty of not critically reviewing and evaluating our programs, but it is an essential step.

I believe that you must be very careful in defining skills and staff. Numerous advertisements for enrollment managers have indicated that several years of admissions work is a prerequisite. I do not believe that this is necessary, or in some cases even advantageous.

The skills which are required for an enrollment management

leader will be different at various institutions. If you have a weak admissions office, you may want an enrollment management leader who has a very strong admissions background. If the admissions staff is competent, you may want someone who is more of a leader, researcher, or organizer. These factors must be defined for each institution; but I offer the following general guidelines which should be considered in addition to the specific skills which you define as necessary for your institution.

An individual in an enrollment management supervisory position should:

1. Be an effective manager and administrator. In addition to the normal items which would fall under the jurisdiction of a manager or administrator, I would be certain to include the four "Is" - innovator, initiator, implementor, investor. The person should be someone who can create ideas; launch them; work with them; and invest the time, and energy which is necessary.
2. Be a leader. There is a very important difference and distinction between being a manager or administrator and being a leader. I believe that we sometimes overlook this fact in higher education administration. Keller (1983) indicated that administration sees that things are done right and works for efficiency; and that management makes sure that the right things are done and works for effectiveness. On the other hand, leadership strives to stimulate and cause people to react. Hersey and Blanchard

(1982) defined leadership as the "process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group ..." (p. 83). A leader is more than a manager or administrator.

3. Be a Developer. Bradford and Cohen (1984) talk about the Manager-as-Developer, a leader who is interested in developing the potential of her subordinates, even at the expense of not providing all of the answers when they are readily apparent to her. She strives for shared responsibility. She works with her subordinates, not over them. She wants to broaden the perspective of others - to develop them, and to create an effective team. The team concept is very important for enrollment management.
4. Be a communicator. Enrollment management must involve the entire campus. The person responsible for enrollment management efforts must be able to articulate the purposes of enrollment management and the actions which are needed. He must be able to rally support and interact effectively with faculty members as well as administrators.
5. Have a working knowledge of enrollment management. A person does not need to know all the details about financial aid, admissions, retention, or whatever elements are included in the enrollment management program; but the enrollment manager should be familiar with the reading, research, and activities of each. He should be able to ask the right questions, to probe areas, to make others think, and to provoke action.

6. Possess a minimal knowledge of computers and research. A leader in enrollment management must understand database management, what can and cannot be accomplished with the institutions's computer systems, and the type of enrollment management data which should be maintained. He must be able to interpret research studies, and understand the type of research which is necessary so that he can insure that it is being undertaken.
7. Be willing to take risks. Books such as In Search of Excellence and Re-inventing the Corporation have stressed the value of risk taking in the business world. An enrollment manager must know when to - and when not to - take risks. Higher education institutions must be willing to take calculated risks in various areas from new admissions markets, to innovative curriculum changes, to new financial aid strategies, to new retention programs.

I offer this comparison between a director of enrollment management and an orchestra conductor. The conductor is critical to the functioning of the orchestra. He integrates the various parts, and controls the timing and tempo of individual members. He strives to achieve the best from each individual and section. He brings to the forefront and focuses attention on specific sections at the appropriate times. The conductor realizes that the orchestra will be ineffective without the various units working together; and he, therefore, strives for harmony and the reduction of discord. The conductor works at acquiring the best

performance from each member, and must function in different roles to do so. He must be a teacher, communicator, leader, administrator, and promoter. He must be an external person and must represent the orchestra to many various publics. He must look for good talent, and encourage individuals to sharpen their skills and become virtuosos. The conductor must recognize the weaknesses within the orchestra and address the problems knowing that one inadequate section will affect the total performance. He must continually fine tune the operation of each unit and the orchestra as a whole. In summary, the conductor's job is to ensure that everyone is playing together, that the various sections are integrated and blended to achieve the desired outcome.

Enrollment management will be an issue that is addressed formally or informally on most of our campuses. I hope that I have communicated the idea that enrollment management is not admissions management. It is more - much more - and involves the "whole student." I hope that you will have sufficient drive to consider the situation at your campus; to think or rethink your ideas, your philosophical position, and your projections concerning the quantity and quality of students at your institution for the next decade. Finally, I hope that a picture of an ostrich with its head in the sand will not depict you.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arbeiter, S. (Fall, 1985). Guns, butter or sheepskins. The College Board Review, 137, 16-21, 30-31, 33.
- Bradford, D. L., & Cohen, A. R. (1984). Managing for excellence. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Breland, H. M., Wilder, G., & Robertson, N. J. (1986). Demographics, standards, and equity: Challenges in college admissions. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Counselors, The American College Testing Program, The College Board, Educational Testing Service, National Association of College Admissions Counselors.
- Caren, W. A., & Kemerer, F. R. (1979). The internal dimensions of institutional marketing. College and University, 54 (3), 173-188.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1981). Three thousand futures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education. (June 11, 1986). p. 22. quoting United States Department of Education.
- Frances, C. (1984). 1985: The economic outlook for higher education. AAHE Bulletin. 37 (4), 3-6.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hossler, D. (1984). Enrollment management: An integrated approach. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kemerer, F., Baldrige, J. V., & Green, K. C. (1982). Strategies for effective enrollment management. Washington: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Kreutner, L., & Godfrey, E. S. (Winter, 1980-81). Enrollment management: A new vehicle for institutional renewal. College Board Review, 118, 6-9, 29.
- Leach, E. R. (1984). Marketing to adult populations. NASPA Journal, 21 (4), 9-16.
- LeBoeuf, M. (1985). The greatest management principle in the world. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

McConnell, W. R., & Kaufman, N. (1984). High school graduates: Projections for the fifty states (1982-2000). Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Teachers Insurance Annuity Association, and The College Board.

Pollock, C. R. (1986). Enrollment management structures and activities at four year institutions of higher education. Doctoral dissertation in press. University of Massachusetts - Amherst.